

<b><i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i></b>		Application No. 10/598,448	Applicant(s) POTKE, MARCO
		Examiner Mia M. Thomas	Art Unit 2624

**All Participants:**

(1) Mia M. Thomas.

(2) Mr. Matthew Anderson (Registration #39,093).

**Date of Interview:** 9 June 2011

**Status of Application:** appeal conference

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant    ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes    ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:  
*103 rejections; potential 101 rejections and Claim objections (re: improper multiple dependents)*

Claims discussed:  
*1-17*

Prior art documents discussed:  
*Kriegel and Domanik (made of record)*

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:  
*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/JASON M REPKO/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2624  
/Mia M Thomas/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2624

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

The Examiner contacted the applicant's representative after an appeal conference with SPE J. Repko and SPE S. Ahmed on 02 June 2011. The conferees agreed that the Examiner should withdraw the rejections based on the applicant's arguments in the appeal brief. Additionally, the conferees agreed that the Kriegel reference taught several of the limitations of the previously pending claims but that a more suggestive secondary reference could be used to properly reject the claims properly under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

In an effort to expedite prosecution of the instant application, the conferees suggested that the Examiner contact the applicant's representative to discuss possibly amending the claims to place the application in condition for allowance. The Examiner contacted the applicant's representative with two relevant prior art references and two suggestions for allowable subject matter. After discussion between the Examiner and the applicant's representative, the parties agreed to the claims as now presented in the Examiner's Amendment attached herewith.

The Examiner wishes to thank the applicant's representative for the effort and willingness to agree to a solution that now places this application in condition for allowance.

Applicant's representative summary: The proposed amendments (see newly amended claims at PTO Notice of Allowability/Examiner's Amendment) above are intended to correspond to the Examiner's suggestions. Claim 1 is amended to add a limitation corresponding to previous claim 12, now cancelled. Claim 17 is cancelled in favor of new claim 18, specifying an apparatus that performs the method of claim 1 or claim 5. Other claims are amended to simplify dependency, remove Jepson-style "characterized in that" language, and to correct informalities. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to discuss any remaining issues, and is authorized to enter the proposed amendments as an Examiner's Amendment if they are acceptable for allowance.